N586.4
M567.5c

The Meadville Journal

Vol. XXVI JANUARY, 1932 No. II

Religion, Art and Science
Howard N. Brown

The Art of Health
Horatio W. Dresser

Epicureanism—Old and New
Robert J. Hutcheon

Naturalism
George Croswell Cressey

Published Quarterly by
THE MEADVILLE THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL
(Founded in Pennsylvania in 1844)
5701 Woodlawn Avenue, Chicago

The Meadville Journal

Vol. XXVI, No. II
January, 1932

Published by
THE MEADVILLE THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL
5701 Woodlawn Avenue, Chicago
JANUARY APRIL JULY OCTOBER

Entered as Second-class matter November 12, 1930, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of Congress of August 24, 1912

Our Contributors

Howard Nicholson Brown, D.D., was ordained to the Unitarian Ministry in 1874 and was the minister of The First Parish, Brookline, Mass., from 1873-1895. In 1895 he became the minister of King's Chapel, Boston, and has continued there ever since as minister and minister-emeritus. He is the author of three volumes and for many years was the president of the Board of Trustees of the *Christian Register*.

Horatio Willis Dresser, Ph.D., graduated with the degree of Ph.D. from Harvard University in 1907. He taught philosophy in Harvard from 1903 to 1911 and Ursinus College, Collegeville, Pa., in 1912-1913. He is the author of about thirty volumes on philosophical, psychological and ethical topics. The lecture published here was delivered in the chapel of the First Unitarian Church, Chicago, in December, 1931.

Robert J. Hutcheon, D.D., has been the Professor of the Psychology and Philosophy of Religion since 1913 in the Meadville Theological School.

George Crosswell Cressey, Ph.D., D.D., is a graduate of Bowdoin College, of Yale University, of the University of Leipzig, Germany, and of Andover Theological School. He has held Unitarian pastorates in London, England, New York, Lyngsboro, Mass., and Geneseo, Ill.

An interesting article on Emily Dickinson was prepared by Professor Clayton R. Bowen, Th.D., for this number of the Meadville Journal, but the publishers of her works would not grant permission to quote from her writings or from those of her biographer and the article, therefore, could not be published. The Editor.

Religion, Art and Science

Howard N. Brown

The ancient alliance between religion and art which has no doubt made in some ways for the glory and advantage of both, has nevertheless produced some unfortunate results. Now and again indeed it has been fraught with positive disaster. Neither of the two is committed by its origin to much concern for ethical ideals; and neither therefore has always been able to serve the other as effective mentor and guide. The original task of religion was to build some kind of bridge between the seen and an unseen world. To this day its characteristic interest, take the world together, is in the traffic that is supposedly maintained over this bridge. And this enterprise had been going on for ages, apparently, before it occurred to anybody that ethical considerations had much to do with the problem.

The ethical training of both the artist and the priest had to be supplied in the first instance, one may guess, from a source outside their special callings. Certainly this was true in Hebrew history where the prophet rather than the priest was the teacher of righteousness. And the religious mind, left to itself, generally manifests a tendency to become so much absorbed in the practice of its religious rites as to feel rather a languid interest in the progress of moral enlightenment. The wily Jacob, having frequent interviews with beings of a supernatural order, and supposing himself peculiarly blessed by them in such undertakings as the theft of his brother's birthright, is still typical of a vast deal of the world's religion.

It is no doubt true that it has been part of the business of religion to provide an essential foundation for the erection of moral structures. But getting a foundation does not necessarily imply the ability to build upon it a worth while edifice. In point of fact whenever the idea of a kingdom of heaven on

earth has been injected into the religious consciousness of mankind it has often fared much like a cultivated flower in a garden of weeds. Nature on the whole prefers the weeds. And there is something to be said in this instance on behalf of nature's preference. For when it comes to a question of ultimate values, if there be no other world but this, then the worth of this world is so slight as to become rather insignificant; while, if that other world is waiting for us, we are likely to find there for the first time the full meaning of our existence here.

As for the tendency of art, unhampered and untutored by outside instruction, to hoist its banner of "Art for Art's own sake," and to wander off into realms where "there ar'nt no ten commandments," there can be little need to speak. The alliance of these two, where there is no further addition to their counsels, ought not to be expected to produce much moral gain. When the general state of society does not hold them to some account for their doings they go their way, for indefinite periods of time, sublimely indifferent to the world's moral welfare.

Certainly it seems desirable that this long established partnership should be increased and strengthened, if possible, by the addition of a third member who might serve at least as a useful critic of the proceedings of the other two. The prophet, hitherto has served with some success in that capacity. But he could not be very well taken into the firm. His relations with the priest and with the artist are by no means likely to be those of friendly coöperation. If we could get the priest and the prophet rolled up into one, and both infused with an artistic spirit, that would be an ideal combination. It is, however, as the world stands, a combination somewhat difficult to find and rather hard to maintain,—in any just proportions. Where both roles are attempted there is likely to be either too much prophet or too much priest. The two are not well calculated to appreciate each other's virtues.

Meanwhile a great new power called science has come into the world and has begun to show some interest in the affairs of religion. What are the possibilities of an alliance

here that would be helpful to religion; and where, if anywhere, should the church be on its guard against the intrusion of this new critic into its domain? There are signs that this is now being recognized as one of the most important questions of our time. Thus far science has not assumed to apply its methods very much to matters of religious faith except through its investigation into the character and sources of ancient literatures, to which the church has ascribed divine authority. The results of this investigation may not appear to be in themselves of very great significance; but the question whether or not the church is willing to receive instruction from this source may be none the less of the highest consequence. In fact, one may say that it is almost the question of all others so far as the future of the church is now concerned. For its determination may decide whether religion and science can now come into friendly relations elsewhere than in a few individual minds.

If the church will in this instance open its mind to give a dispassionate hearing to what the scientific method has to present there is a possibility of further conference and consideration, which may be to the advantage of both sides. But if the church utterly refuses to accept any demonstration here that tends to modify its ancient belief, that may be taken to indicate that christian institutions in general will make no such alliance with science as they have hitherto made with art. The clamor that has been raised over this question evinces a widespread feeling that a really momentous issue is being decided in our time.

It may be said that with or without the consent of the church the impact of scientific thought is bound to produce upon it some notable results; and this is probably true. No one can bar the shutters of his mind so closely but some light of a common day will find entrance, and even a little may work considerable transformation. All institutions are wrought upon by the time spirit of successive ages, and it would be a miracle indeed if the church could altogether escape the reshaping hand of the ruling influence in modern thought. Some of the changes made by a scientific age in the attitude

and spirit of religion may be glanced at, as tokens of what a deeper mutual interest between the two might well bring to pass.

One of the marked characteristics of minds trained in the study of science is a passion for truth and reality. They will have no "make-believe," and no pretense that things are thus and so because that is the way they would like to have them. They wish to know as exactly as possible how the case really stands, no matter whether this completes or shatters mental conceptions which they have already formed. It would be too much to say that all scientific men are entirely unprejudiced in their search for truth, or in their treatment of new ideas. But it is fair to say that science on the whole has erected standards of whole souled veracity, and of contempt for mere logic chopping, to which churchmen as a body have not yet attained.

The bane of religion all along has been, not only its blind reliance upon traditional ideas and usages, but its "will to believe"; its grim determination, by hook or crook, to force belief in what it was thought right or expedient to believe. Any one who listens over the radio to the "hours" which various forms of faith are conducting can but be struck, now and again, with the childishness of the arguments presented in support of one or another conclusion. They are not the candid utterance of a mature and unbiased judgment; at least they do not sound like that, but more like the specious pleas put forth by a child when it wants its own way.

However, there is far less of this than there used to be in religious argumentation, and it is a fair supposition that the scientific mind has inoculated religious thought with something of its own candor. When one listens to ministers called "liberal," representing different denominations, it is impossible to tell from anything they say to what branch of the church they belong. One hears nothing of the trifling differences on unimportant matters that have so much divided Christendom in the past, and all seem equally intent on some aspect of great fundamental realities. Indeed something of the rather extreme dislike for fanciful conjecture which per-

vades scientific circles, begins to show in the preachers of the day. Imagination has its place and its rights; but it generally needs pruning as much as a luxuriant vine, and that service science seems admirably equipped to perform for religion. It appears to be quite certain that science in our day is thus helping religion to the attainment of a more reasonable faith, and that the continuance of this influence can be counted upon through days to come.

Another way in which scientific thought is bound in the end to produce a profound impression on the religious mind, though it may be a slower process, is by way of instilling a greater regard for intellectual freedom. Religion by its very nature is rather overweighted with conservatism and too fearful of new ideas. This is because it is so largely an affair of sentiment which is always averse to change. When you have lived in a house for many years and have grown fond of its appointments, the health officer who comes to point out the defects of its sanitary arrangements, or the artist friend who kindly tells you how it could be made much more beautiful, is not a welcome visitor. You prefer the house just as it is and you do not wish to have it improved out of its old likeness.

Religion instinctively dreads even the most necessary alterations; and its first, if not its abiding impulse, is to chase every reformer outside its portals. This tendency to keep things as they are, unless it can be partly checked and counteracted, produces an extreme rigidity both in credal form and interpretation; so that it becomes all but impossible for new ideas to get into the mind of the church. And this is now getting to be a serious matter so far as the future influence of the church is concerned. We have come to a time when entire mental freedom is a mere commonplace of modern life beyond the pale of the church, and when most thinking people feel the same contempt for a mind not at liberty to think for itself that the free man feels for a willing slave.

Considerable difficulty has been experienced of late in recruiting for the ministry among our various institutions of learning. Young men do not volunteer in sufficient numbers, and the quality of those who do come forward is not always

of the best. Many reasons can be assigned for their unwillingness to enter this calling. One of the most important of these reasons may well be that, on the scale of values which bears the sanction of science, entering the ministry appears too much like joining an inferior caste. It is not so much that religious ideas are repellent to scientific thought as that the men who expound these ideas are not supposed to be, as a rule, free men. It is as if they were set to teach a kind of physics or chemistry in which no new discoveries were to be allowed, and whose formulas had been standardized beyond possibility of further modification.

Religious institutions will have to rest under the strong disfavor of the dominant intellectual forces of the modern world till they give their teaching force more liberty. The situation has probably been improved in recent years. Many ministers are now as free as anybody. But their numbers are still too small to lighten very much the cloud of opprobrium that lies upon the profession as a whole. We must hope that here again science is producing some effect upon religion. If it can incite the clergy to more effort to break the shackles in which blind sentiment has too much bound them, and lead them out of a thralldom which is rapidly becoming more despicable the more patiently it is endured, theology may once more take its place, if not as queen, at least as a peer among the sciences and arts.

Again, science may be of vast benefit to religion by helping to deliver it from a demoralizing dependence upon and hunt for miracles. This is not to say that it is in any wise likely to drive religion altogether from its belief in miracle, within any future that we can foresee. Its proof of the habitual stability of nature's sequences is not a perfect demonstration that these sequences are never broken; and its assumption that they are absolutely inviolable rests upon a metaphysical basis that is by no means beyond criticism. Meanwhile a clock-work universe is not entirely congenial to the human spirit, which will probably cling to an idea of the freedom of the divine mind, as well as its own, against any amount of theorizing that can be brought against it.

But aside from all question whether or not miracles do sometimes occur, and however beneficent they may be (granted that they do occasionally come to pass), it is perfectly obvious that the hunt for them, if much indulged in, soon becomes debasing and dangerous. Again and again this has robbed popular religion of all its influence for good, and has turned it into a traffic in magic and spells utterly subversive of moral discipline. The doctor and not the priest is our proper guide in dealing with the ills of the flesh; because, even if the latter does sometimes effect a miraculous cure, his help is very uncertain in any given case; and widespread dependence upon that help is at best a kind of gambling which interferes much with the world's gain in social order and welfare. Only science perhaps can teach this lesson effectively to the common mind. At all events it can give incalculable help to the best kinds of religion in their efforts to be rid of the miracle monger, and no true friend of religion can afford to ignore that aid.

It is to be observed that in these instances scientific thought is not represented as a large contributor to the stock of religious ideas but rather as a critic, friendly or otherwise, whose influence tends to do away with certain excesses and excrescences of belief and custom that are apt to grow up in the religious mind. But though they should be taken as typical instances in this respect, such removal of unwholesome accretions is a piece of surgery much needing to be performed. The church is not in a most hopeful way till something of the sort can be done. It can undoubtedly live for a long while yet to come. But it is quite certain that it can enter upon no new career of conquest unless it can once more present to the world, as it has presented in the past, what the world regards as a reasonable faith. It is not enough to persuade itself that it has such a faith. It must offer to the general mind a case which, whether or not accepted at once for truth, appears to that mind as if it might perfectly well be true. Now science is not in the least likely to write a body of doctrine to put in place of the creeds of the church; but it can help religion to

shape its main ideas into what the present day world will regard as a more reasonable faith.

To bring this coöperation to pass there should be friendly relations between the two; and they are not so congenial as to make those relations quite easy to establish. They live for the most part, as it were, in different worlds. The special province of the one, by inheritance at least, is what in the scientific sense of the word is called "the unknown"; while the other belongs rather strictly to the province of the definitely known. One walks more by faith, the other by sight. Some scientific men, it is true, have manifested great faith, as much as any churchman could boast. But as a rule science does not bother its head much with conjectural matters, save as they may lie rather close at hand, along a border line where there is good hope of adding the unexplored to mapped and measured territory. Religion however habitually sends its thoughts far on into realms of mystery, which there is no expectation of reducing to plain matter-of-fact, at least for ages yet to come.

And it is precisely out of these mysteries that it gathers a hope which it proclaims to be the world's salvation. Science, as it pushes its way slowly forward into the secrets of nature has, of course, its working hypothesis, to blaze for itself a forward trail. But religion wants and must have, to amount to anything of consequence, much more than that. It wants a dominating faith, a real "substance of things hoped for"; not something that it holds loosely for immediate practical purposes, but something that holds it through storm and cloud with a never loosened grasp, as the compass needle is drawn to its pole.

Now there is no reason why the same mind should not be both religious and scientific; why it should not use its measuring chains where they can be made to apply, and beyond that let its poetic insight have free play. But one can see that such a mind must be broader than the average range of mental endowments; that these different mental habits are apt to breed diverse temperaments whose angles do not fit into each other without considerable friction. Perhaps it is not possible

at this stage of the world's development to make any such alliance between religion and science as has heretofore existed between religion and art.

All the same it would be advantageous for the religious man everywhere to know what he can about science, and to imbibe something of its spirit. Also one may guess that it would be equally advantageous for the scientific man to know more than he commonly does about religion. He should know that it has been a mighty power in the world throughout the past, both for good and ill; and that while its superstitions still rest like a pall on millions of human beings, its inspirations have led the way to the loftiest heights of character and achievement man has yet attained. To make it an inspirational rather than a depressing influence in the common mind is a task well worthy of his helping hand.

Surely there is hope that if churchmen and scientists can thus come to know each other better, religious institutions can be gradually lifted to a higher intellectual level, where they may cease to stultify the reason of mankind; and that science can be cured of a short-sightedness which sometimes makes it blind to great moral issues that sway the world's life, so that things like submarines and poison gases need no longer be counted among the triumphs of its inventive skill.

The Art of Health

By Horatio W. Dresser

Someone has said, "There is nothing so dangerous as a half-truth." This is particularly the case in such teachings as Christian Science and the New Thought. Lest the following study of the art of health be identified in any way with such teachings, I wish to indicate at the outset certain prevailing errors in these less than half-truths of the mind-cure movement, although I acknowledge some indebtedness to P. P. Quimby. In this movement as a whole there is a woeful lack of genuine psychology; utter neglect of the facts of organic and functional diseases, consequently an enormous over-emphasis on the alleged mental causes of disease, even in case of nervous disorders; and great confusion concerning the relation of God and man, man and nature. In short, there is no intelligible view of human personality, of the causes of human difficulties and their cure. As a result—speaking from an acquaintance with this movement since 1882, when it became known as the "Boston craze"—real disorders and conflicts are glossed over; manifold illusions if not delusions result, as in the case of phantastic ideas about absent treatment; and relapses occur when the illusions wane and people who deemed themselves "cured" are compelled to face the troubles which had been obscured by a tissue of abstractions. Mr. Quimby had said, "The explanation is the cure." But neither Christian Science nor New Thought offers any real explanation of disease.

The resource for those of us who disavow these misleading notions is to maintain a radically different point of view, by frankly admitting the facts of disease as physical, by adopting the best psychology we can find, including the contributions of psychoanalysis; and by seeking light on disorders which are most intimately related to man's inner life as a whole, his attitude, his modes of adjustment in the home, and

the sort of life man might live by rational adaptation to existence in all its phases. In what follows the emphasis will fall on the inner self as the centre of energies which man can learn to wield; on the spirit with respect to the deepest incentives for attaining the fulness of life, by becoming centrally integrated, co-ordinated, balanced. The art of health thus regarded is part of the philosophical art of life; it calls for profounder knowledge of the self, for a philosophy.

The physical basis of health is of course taken for granted, by aid of abundant exercise, rest and sleep; through prudence or moderation, with due regard for the nervous system, the avoidance of excesses of every sort, tensions, strains, and frictions due to immoderate living. Health is as surely mental in part, through training and wise use of the intellectual powers, with a view to order, system, balance between head and heart, mind and brain; the development of concentration, foresight; understanding of the emotions, especially the courser and more intense emotions which exhaust our energies; emphasis on a scale of values, wise effort, inner control; in a word, sanity in the modern sense of unity through many-sided development. So, too, health is moral, with special emphasis on integrity or honesty, fidelity to principle, serving one master, without subterfuges; in a life as free as possible from evasiveness of every sort, such as shirking moral responsibility, the effort to run away from difficulties by indulging in mere excuses as if one could "get by." For experience in dealing with the problems of personality shows that internal moral conflict is a great disturber of health, also that there is no substitute for facing the central moral issues.

Health is here regarded as also spiritual in the sense of an appeal to openness or receptivity combined with alert responsiveness according to the values of the inner life; with peace at the centre, repose, equanimity; with insight or intuition to the fore, for example through appeal to the spontaneous thoughts of the early morning hours. This conception of the spiritual life implies the supremacy of the eternal values in a scale from within outward. Granted inner control, poise and calmness at the centre, a method of life and work

follows, with adjustments from within outward, by meeting new experiences such as shocks or events occurring in novel situations so as to keep outside of any upheaval, keeping out of woes and miseries when no good will come from entering into them, and concentrating on one's life-purpose. One must then settle every personal issue as soon as may be, hiding nothing crucial. Thus keeping open and free at the centre, one should be able to do one's work in the world far more effectively. Health in this larger sense is wholeness through harmony of body, mind, spirit.

The opportunity for such an art of health is suggested by the old-time question concerning people of obvious physical health, say athletes, who may succumb rapidly to disease or die young; while men of frail physique may live to an advanced age. While the athlete has vigorous powers of bodily resistance, he may lack mental organization, may not know how to combat fear, nervousness, excitement, and other adverse mental states; hence he is wholly at the mercy of the practitioner into whose hands he may chance to fall. But the frail man, for instance Immanuel Kant, may have a health problem so vital for one of his type that he must master his difficulties and acquire an art of adjustment or be unable to do his work or to attain a great age. Granted such a problem with mind enough to solve it, a man needs especially to know his temperament as thoroughly as possible, to understand his moods, both favorable and unfavorable, his dispositional trends involving inner disturbance or friction in contrast with trends that make for calmness and self-control, also his emotions and impulses in the light of their value for the preservation of health. To solve such a problem a man must consider his habit-formations, how he lives and works; notably habits that involve nervous haste, worry, excitement, and work done under pressure or coercion, or through misuse of energy. Granted willingness to learn the lessons of experience by looking to one's self first, one's attitude toward people and toward life, one is in a position to understand the part played by inner control.

We may illustrate the physical aspect of the art of health

by the experience of George Bernard Shaw as described by Henry Neil, in "Physical Culture," Nov., 1929. Mr. Neil says of Shaw, "His movements bespeak energy. His body and brain are matched to a remarkable degree by a rapier-like keenness. He is a live wire, a human dynamo."

What appears to be Shaw's secret? For one thing, it is physical exercise, at the wood-pile, in cycling, boxing, swimming. Again, Shaw is a vegetarian. Ever since he was a boy he has "eaten a diet composed almost exclusively of fruits and vegetables." Yet others have done this but have not acquired an art of health. The turning-point for Shaw came as a boy from an impetus he gained by observing his father, who one day said to him: "My son, I'm afraid I'm a failure. Take me as your guide. Whatever I've done, don't do." One wishes there were a hundred thousand fathers as frank with their sons as the elder Shaw, and that hundreds of thousands of sons were as ready to profit by paternal experience. Observing his father carefully, the young George noted the fact that his father "ate indiscriminately and large quantities of meat, that he smoked all day and drank alcohol, and that he took no form of exercise. . . . So from that date Shaw ate no meat and not only did he eschew alcohol, but he also gave up tea and coffee. He did not smoke. He took all the exercise he could manage. He found this régime suited him. His body gained perfect health and his brain became clearer and more brilliant every day." No less important is Shaw's remark to Mr. Neil that doctors cannot cure disease, but can at best only help intelligent people to prevent getting disease. "The people who live rightly and eat correctly do not become diseased." One would add that people actually live rightly because they understand themselves, their type, their forces, how to adapt themselves to life according to their type; because they are able to control and use the mind as an instrument and through the mind the body. One might or might not be a vegetarian. One might or might not use the mind in Shaw's way. But everyone has a great lesson to learn by study of others and himself, and certainly everybody would like to possess something like Shaw's keenness and command.

Or take the health problem of a very different type of person, a man who came under the writer's observation. This man was the child of two sometime invalids, with a frail physique, nervous, excitable, hypersensitive, screaming and walking in his dreams, so that his parents kept him away from all sources of excitement during the day, as far as possible. Highly imaginative, with egocentric trends, this boy was adversely conditioned not only because he was deprived of out-of-door sports and had no contact with strenuous conditions of any sort; but because he was unduly protected, had no opportunity for developing resistance of any sort. Retreating from reality, he became reclusive in high degree, timid, shy in the presence of strangers, finding compensation only in his day-dreams. The result nervously speaking was an early habit of stammering which in turn heightened his sense of inferiority, so that at puberty he developed a marked trend toward introversion. Moreover, as the only child, he had been regarded as a model from whom great achievements were expected.

For this hypersensitive individual the art of health was necessarily a question of physical exercise and development at first, that he might acquire a basis for resistance and control. With the increase of physical strength and nerve-control, it was possible for him to undermine both his timidity and his stammering by intellectual training, practice for poise and moderation, and by the aid of experiences making for self-reliance and the triumph over his excessive sensitivity. Furthermore, his re-education included the analysis and mastery of disease-patterns and fears which were a hold-over from the invalidism of his parents.

Finally, the trends toward excessive introspection were sublimated into profitable modes of studying the inner life, in favor of the cultivation of a closely reasoned philosophy.

Granted interest in fostering the art of health as a temperamental problem, one is ready to draw upon inner resources, before seeking advice by describing one's symptoms to another person, who might at once identify these with the pattern of a well-known disease likely to run its course apart

from the whole sphere of inner control. Thus in case of a slight fever, when one's temperature is going up and the symptoms are a bit threatening, one might at once awaken and alarm the household; or, pausing to regain calmness and control, one might first try what can be accomplished by regarding the physical condition as incidental or trivial, likely to be overcome by coöperative quietude, without fear, certainly without excitement. So in the presence of any adverse circumstance, like cold weather, under conditions where one is ill-prepared to meet it, there is opportunity for a try-out. One might illustrate by a personal experience as a Y.M.C.A. secretary in the war-zone in France in 1918, in the dead of winter, in an untenanted, unfurnished and half shot-up brick house. To be transported from the comforts of a well-heated house at home to the discomforts of sleeping on an army cot in one's clothes, while struggling to keep the cold from getting into one's system, is certainly a new experience for one who is trying out the art of health. The critic might ask, why not give up, call one's self sick and go to an army hospital for recovery? Because one would then become merely a passenger in one's body and one wishes to retain inner control. Each victory won is an impetus to gain other victories.

In acquiring an art of health it is important, however, to discriminate between activities which come directly within the power of the will and those that do not. For the changes come from within outward according to established sequences, subconscious responses and bodily results. One is constrained to utter several truisms in this connection, to the effect that we live in a universe of law and order, beset by conditions which we did not choose, where no man by taking thought can change one hair white or black. Moreover, neither mind nor body exercises any choice: the organism is an obedient servant.

Note the fact, for example, that the organism serves saints and sinners equally well—granted the appropriate ruling love. It serves the thief, cunning and crafty in his warfare on society, utilizing a behavior-pattern which law-abiding citizens might well envy. Whether trained or untrained, it readily expresses what wins your attention long enough to become

organized into your patterns and habits. Hatred will be splendidly expressed if you respond to it so that it sweeps away all opposition. Anger will function if your organism is not trained to sublimate it. So too it is well equipped for manifesting bitterness, jealousy, all the courser emotions. The organism is admirably adapted for the expression of fear, excitement, impulsiveness, nervousness, self-indulgence, sensuality, secret vice, drunkenness and all the rest. It suits the miser very well, also the egocentric person of whatever type, such as the introvert. It is well-adapted for concealing motives, for "getting by."

On the other hand, if you have calmness or control enough to pause and consider what attitude to adopt, what pattern to accept, and what goal to seek, you will in time be able indirectly to check many an impulse to fear, to send forth hate, rage or bitterness. Your organism (both mind and brain, thus the body) is ready to follow—in case it has been so trained. Inner peace may be embodied in equanimity or serenity, repose, gentleness of manner; and the brow will eventually become serene, the tone of voice will correspond, also the general behavior.

When or under what conditions has the spirit through the mind the greatest power over the body? Surely not in any instance of mere expression, as in violent emotion. It is in the initial stages, when we stand at the cross-roads selecting between adverse criticism and friendly response, hate and love, self-love and love toward others, fear or inner excitement and inner peace; between a negative image or attitude and a positive; a disease-making or trouble-fostering pattern and a pattern for health and harmony.

To discern the power of our initiatives, it is essential to consider what we mean by inner control. Certainly not "self-control" in the popular sense. We mean control by the self or spirit of states or dispositions which, like inner peace, composure, calmness, are most favorable as a basis; states which foster stability or constancy, which involve a high degree of coördination or integration. Our object is to control any state which like excitement, uncritical fear, mere worry, mere

impulse, or unscrutinized emotion, tends to run to excess. By controlling these states we hope to undermine impatience, nervous tension and pressure.

We begin by cultivating the ideals and associates by which we identify the self with the purpose we have in view in attaining a philosophic art of life. We wish to substitute calmness for excitement on all occasions, courage for fear, moderation for impulsiveness, a spontaneous life for an over-plus of inhibitions. Thus we hope to advance to a higher degree of articulation or organization. The road to mastery is through study of our particular life-problem.

A physician who lived to the age of one hundred frankly admitted that the turning-point came for him when he was fifty-six. He had dragged along with nervous dyspepsia for twenty-five years—as most of us slump along, without seeking the causes of our misery. Then at last he busied himself with the effort to discover all the causes of his disorder and to overcome them. Learning what these causes were, he learned much more about himself, his mind, his body. He discovered that he needed a bettered art of life. In solving one problem he solved several. Incidentally, he learned how to live one hundred years.

Much depends, one insists, on first pausing to consider what our spiritual reserves are with respect to our particular need or problem; first looking within and above, that we may once more renew our highest incentives, however each of us may articulate these according to our idea of the divine. Then we are in a position to approach our need in the light of our practical faith in health as already stated. Granted this inward renewal, we take our clues, psychologically speaking, from the best contemporary teaching; and with respect to the body we displace fanciful notions concerning disease by the most enlightened medical opinion.

A recent medical writer calls attention to three outstanding misconceptions regarding disease-processes: the notion that such processes are "harmful," the absurd idea that they are "unnatural," and the strange notion that they are "lawless." "Far from being 'harmful,' " writes Dr. Clendening

(Logan Clendening, in "The Human Body," p. 324), "the great bulk of changes in the body in disease are distinctively protective . . . the best defence, the best adjustment which the body can make to the inroads of the external world." This is notably the case in wound healing, the knitting of bones, the enlargement of the heart to overcome mechanical derangements or high pressure. For existence as thus described is a fight against "every sort of malignant influence . . . fire, water, poison . . . cold . . . storm." In these terms, disease is the "interaction between these objects and the body's defences—and is perfectly normal and natural." Hence there are natural laws involved in every process.

From this point of view it is of course difficult to draw a line between health and disease. For example, inflammation may indicate congestion as a part of the healing process, pain being the outstanding symptom. Since the pain is increased by movement, this sensation is a "plain warning from nature not to move the bruised or the infected part." So too fever is a "heat regulation," the symptom being an indication of a process which is "distinctively helpful and protective." The old-time method was to "break the fever with drugs and such other methods as sweating and bathing." But fever, as Dr. Clendening describes it, is a "beautifully adapted method for the protection of the body against the army of microscopic invaders." A symptom is not then a detriment but a "protective device." The principle is this: "The body must overcome . . . or be overcome. The mechanisms of defence are numerous." Again, some people are hypersensitive to some substances which are harmful to others, such as emanations from animals, pollen which causes hay-fever, or infections causing asthma. Clendening notes the fact that for all forms of insult the body has elaborated some form of defence.

More significant still is the statement, backed by the results noted by other highly experienced practitioners, that at least 50 percent of the patients treated by him *had no organic disease at all.* Instead, they were sick because their minds, their lives were "warped." In other words, the symptoms of the disease-process of whatever sort represented what

Dr. Clendening calls "the adaptation of the patient to his life up to the time of their origin." Here then is a highly important point, the fact that most patients are "totally unconscious of the steps by which they got sick." The typical patient assumes, for example, that if headache is present, *some* organic disease must be behind it. Discomfort of the stomach is known to be associated with ulcer of the stomach, with gall-bladder disease. Accordingly, the patient assumes that if such discomfort is felt something organic must be the matter. But Dr. Clendening declares that in such instances it is primarily a question of what he calls the "psychic pattern" which is at the root of this organ-fixation. To be sure, it may also be in some cases a question of actual heredity, especially in the psychoses and psychoneuroses. For there may then be a strongly hereditary tendency toward an unstable nervous system. That is, the defences may be inadequate to meet the storms and stresses of life. Hence Dr. Clendening often finds it necessary to dig out the person's life-history, to learn the origin of the prevailing mental state.

More important, however, for people who are acquiring an art of health in accord with enlightened medicine is Dr. Clendening's insistence on the fact that people are greatly misled by the psychic patterns which they associate with nervous states. This is observable in case of neurasthenia, which is supposedly explained on the hypothesis that the nervous system is tired—a gross misconception. The assumption is that the victim has developed nervous breakdown by overwork, by sheer nervous exhaustion. On the contrary, those who are most subject to this alleged nervous collapse are those who have never done fatiguing work of any sort. It is not, says Dr. Clendening, the captain of industry, "with a thousand interests, worries, and responsibilities," who breaks down under the nervous strain. Instead, it is his wife, who takes her breakfast in bed, who is up and dressed only in time for the next round of pleasures, such as bridge-parties; or the rich young man who has just returned from a cruise of the Mediterranean and whose nerves are "all fatigued and granular."

Here Dr. Clendening's observations wholly coincide with the conclusions of applied psychologists who have made a study of such cases. It is not work as such that causes a breakdown, but the frictions and tensions, the inner conflicts with which work is done. The happy, healthy people of the world are usually great workers. Nor is it the wear and tear of our over-speeding civilization that is primarily at fault. There are people who adapt themselves to the modern pace in all its phases without being nervously exhausted by it. Hence one agrees with Dr. Clendening when he insists that it is not a question of the so-called stress and strain of modern life, but of maladjustments in the mode of meeting it. Thus a neurosis may be essentially a maladjustment, namely the individual's unfortunate solution of his problem. The "polite invalid," one may say, is highly unfortunate in her choice. Her invalidism is a defence mechanism to protect her ego, to stave off the day when she must face the issues of her life, to learn how she has generated her trouble.

In conclusion we may summarize some of the important facts and discoveries in this field.

1. Most troubles are generated out of minor difficulties, each of which might have been studied and overcome by itself. Were we in the habit of seeking the facts before indulging in a judgment, we might inhibit the trouble-making associations and psychic patterns by which we so readily intensify or misconceive our little aches and pains, our domestic tribulations, and internal conflicts. We might then avoid the accumulations which have been our undoing in the past.

2. We generate our own troubles, speaking now of matters appertaining to the problems of personality. This is a hard saying. Many of us are so egocentric, so prone to rise up in self-defence, that we attribute our difficulties to anybody or anything rather than ourselves: to circumstances, heredity, fate, the economic order, our parents and grandparents, God, the universe. Yet trouble as we know it and must reckon with it is determined by the conditioned phases of the self—out of some disturbance that is in ourselves, the body, the nervous system, the larger mind (conscious and subconscious), and

our modes of meeting life. Every conflict is essentially internal. Hence we need to look to our own life-history.

3. We are most affected by any experience or influence which gets hold of us on the inside, anything we take home to ourselves so that we identify the self with it, confirm or adopt it, or turn it over and over so that we finally repress it and unwittingly generate a complex. The popular instance is that of a person who takes a love-affair over-seriously or one who tries to put off a sense of guilt or shame. But we also identify with doctrines, fantastic notions about disease and sin. Intermingled with our identification, is our self-love or selfishness, egocentricity or self-pity; our inferiority-superiority; or our ideals—anything which intimately touches the ego for better or worse.

A person may, for example, yield to merely sensuous pleasure, thus to impulse, egocentric emotion, allowing himself to be swept forward until a vigorous reaction occurs. Then comes shame or remorse, if not a sense of guilt, an attempt to conceal and to push the whole matter out of mind. Thus a sufficient impetus is given to generate later trouble, thus conflict ensues between higher and lower; then protectiveness, if not insincerity.

How may conflicts be prevented? By fully and frankly facing the issues at once, admitting any fault and learning its lesson, and righting any wrong to the best of one's ability.

How can a conflict be overcome? By bringing the whole matter out into the daylight of recognition, admission, re-education, just as one would solve any personal problem that is vitally related to the art of health.

The story concerning the way personal problems come about is, of course, a long one. In brief, many difficulties involve, on the social side, too many restraints, too many prohibitions, over-much discipline and punishment; and on the side of individual response too much inhibition, misplaced or excessive self-control, with an accompanying loss of spontaneity and initiative. Thus arises in time an antagonism or rebellion which is kept within the organism. Thus the "libido" or personal energy may be too greatly restrained, and so conflicts

involving the sexual nature may come about. Again, there is over-much conventionality and stiffness, externality, or aristocratic remoteness. Sometimes the conflict begins with an emotional upheaval identified with doctrinal patterns involving notions concerning sin, evil, hell, salvation; to be followed later by internal revolt and hatred of the whole doctrinal scheme. In many instances there is also servile identification with the body, thus with fleshly conditions and organic processes, morbid preoccupation with such processes. Many obscurities result, due to the fact that no distinction is drawn between the conditioned phases of the self and the inner or ideal self. But in time a conflict may arise at this vital point, namely, between the mentality which one is habituated into and the inherent individuality or basic phase of the self. In this revolt a person may become aware for the first time of his reclusiveness or retreat from reality, his phantasies and romancing, and the processes by which he has taken himself too seriously. Again, one may at last see the meaning of so-called self-will, self-assertiveness, self-importance, pride, vanity, egotism, or self-pity. In brief, one may learn one's mistakes in adjustment, one's inability to assimilate new developments and experiences, notably in adolescence, the awakening of love, in delayed or unhappy marriage, in domestic conflicts. So in time one makes the important discovery that these problems of adjustment and maladjustment are so many features of the art of life, namely, subject-matter for such an art because inseparable from the art of health.

Granted such observations and conclusions, which I have here stated in untechnical language adapted to a popular audience, one is ready to assimilate the lessons of individual experience for the benefit of others. It is a significant fact that those who learn most from their own experience and from a study of the failures of other people close at hand, as in Shaw's case, are best equipped to arouse in others the beginnings of an art of health. It is also significant that even the mental-healing movement, in the case of Quimby and his more intelligent followers, began as a quest for such an art. With the rapid development of the psychology of personality in our

day, and the steady advance of medical science, we are acquiring the essentials of an adequate art of health which everyone can understand and apply.

*Epicureanism—Old and New

Robert J. Hutcheon

The word epicureanism derives, as you know, from a Greek philosopher named Epicurus who founded a school of moral philosophy in Athens in 306 B. C. and taught there until his death in 270 B. C. The occasion for the founding of this school, as well as of its rival, the Stoic school, was the terrible moral confusion that then prevailed in the eastern Mediterranean world because of the overthrow of the Greek city-states, the mixing of peoples, cultures and standards brought about by the conquests of Philip and Alexander, and the collapse of the old religions by criticism and contact with other faiths. Whenever an old culture, embracing religion, politics, manners and morals, fails, the individual, who hitherto has been sustained and inspired by the great tradition of his group, is thrown back upon himself and, unless he sinks to the level of mere animality, is compelled to find or construct some philosophy of life, some hierarchy of values, some system of personal discipline, which shall take the place of the old supernaturalism that can no longer be either used or believed. It was to meet the needs of just such persons that the epicurean and stoic schools of moral philosophy were founded. We could not appropriately call Epicurus and Zeno, the founders of these schools, prophets or apostles or martyrs—only some passionate religious faith justifies the use of such names—nevertheless they were both serious men, trying to help people to find such satisfaction and happiness as were still possible in a world where the old traditions were gone and where external life was marked by disorder and a lack of goal which no movement in the immediate future seemed likely to overcome.

My reason for choosing the teaching of Epicurus as my subject tonight is the conviction that we in America are in a somewhat similar moral and spiritual condition to that which

*The Judy Lecture delivered to the Iowa Unitarian Association in November, 1931.

prevailed in Greece when the epicurean and stoic schools were founded. Our inherited supernaturalism is for most thoughtful people in ruins; our older moral standards are in decay or where they are still lived up to are often inwardly questioned; our political life, though ostensibly free because we have the franchise, is so external, so remote, has so little power to awaken our loyalty and give us a mighty cause to live for, that it is hardly to be taken seriously as a spiritual asset at all; our population is so mixed that it is difficult for us to feel that we belong together and to get the spiritual satisfaction that the sense of belonging together generally brings. Hence millions of people are being thrown back upon themselves and compelled either to create some rule or norm of conduct and hold their life together by it or yield to their appetites and drift into whatever conduct the occasion may incite. No such definite moral philosophies as Epicureanism and Stoicism have taken organized form amongst us but movements similar to both exist in unorganized form and I want to speak tonight of what I have called *Epicureanism—Old and New.*

The text from which Epicurus and his followers preached ran somewhat like this: "Pleasure is a good, pain is an evil, therefore, seek pleasure and avoid pain." This may seem to those of us who are still Puritan in our life, thought and feeling, a very doubtful and unromantic philosophy of life to offer to human beings needing moral help and guidance, but the man who preached it was no sensualist and no mere caterer to that which is lowest and most selfish in human nature. He was an ethical philosopher and offered arguments in defence of his creed that have seemed convincing to millions of people in the past and seem so today to millions of our own contemporaries. Indeed, the unconscious moral philosophy which has the widest vogue amongst us is just some form of this old philosophy called epicureanism. In trying to show the inadequacy of this philosophy, therefore, I am not indulging in a mere piece of historical criticism. I am attacking tendencies of thought and conduct that are widespread and powerfully influential in our own immediate environment.

In dealing with this type of moral thought and conduct

I want to go behind Epicurus to Aristippus, a disciple of Socrates, who founded what was called the Cyrenaic school which taught that pleasure was the highest good. In the teaching of Aristippus we have epicureanism in its youthful phase and in the phase which makes it very appealing to youth. In the older parts of the world such as India, China and Japan where ancient systems of customs and traditions are impressed upon the young from the cradle up, the young are helped to overcome the craving for immediacy of feeling and to postpone the enjoyment of many of the goods of life until such time as rational and personal control has become possible. But in our society, for reasons which we need not stop to describe, such social and traditional control of young life has largely broken down. Now, the creed of Aristippus is just the sort of Gospel that undisciplined, inexperienced, youthful human nature longs to hear and live by. He preaches the worth of vivid and immediate feeling, the supreme significance of the present moment. While Plato, another disciple of Socrates, taught that life was a sort of art where many threads, that is, emotions and acts, were to be woven into a great pattern, where the parts were to be subordinated to the whole, where a hierarchy of pleasures and values was to be established, Aristippus makes life a succession of joyful moments, no one of them with precedence over the other, each of them completely justified by its own tang and thrill. What we are to aim at, he says, is not a rational wholeness of life that calls for postponement, suppression and organization, but the passionate enjoyment of the particular pleasures as they come. Joyous living, the immediate zest of life, wringing from each happy moment its last drop of satisfaction—that is the road to happiness.

Now, if this were only the moral creed of a Greek philosopher long since dead, I would not be interested in it in this place, but it seems to me to be the creed, the more or less deliberate philosophy, of multitudes of young men and women today and, therefore, a real live issue. The value of an experience, they say, consists not at all in the total end it helps you to realize, not at all in the quality of virtue which the

community finds in it, but simply and solely in the intensity and mass of the feeling which it evokes. When you have discovered the acts, the human relations, the social occasions, the objects that cause the greatest and most satisfactory shock of feeling to pass through your whole psycho-physical being, abandon yourself to those acts, relations, occasions and objects as often as you can. The thrill of immediate enjoyment is the indication that your nature is functioning adequately, that it is realizing itself, that it is expressing itself in a normal and healthful way.

I have called this creed a philosophy but a moment's reflection will show that no hard thinking ever entered into it. The demand for immediacy of satisfaction is the prolific source of lust, drunkenness, opium-eating and drug-using, of every form of low artificial amusement and of all kinds of innocent but shortsighted ways of living that get us nowhere either as individuals or as communities. The philosophy that finds value only in the vivid and immediate feeling of the present moment would cut the ground not only from every significant virtue but from every art and science as well. In every art and in every science acts of all sorts must be performed, not at all because they bring the doer some thrill, for they may actually be irksome and tedious, but for the sake of some ulterior end. The end determines the acts by which it is attained and all inferior emotions must be subordinated to the great emotion which the achievement of the end brings. Even though pleasure is normally a sign that some useful function is being performed, there is absolutely no principle of guidance to socially significant conduct in pleasurable emotion itself. To conceive of a happy life as a succession of happy moments without any reference to order, organization and grading in a hierarchy of values, would mean, if carried out in practice, to live like a child, to abandon life to the lead of temperament, to surrender all possibility of character for the sake of momentary excitement.

It is not always possible to interpret stories that appear in the daily press but one was told a year or so ago that seems to me to illustrate my point very forcibly. An educated

woman, the wife of an educated man and the mother of a child eighteen months old, abandoned her home, her husband and her child to try the experiment of living with the husband of another woman, who had borrowed a very substantial sum of money to finance the new venture. At the end of three weeks the woman decided that she preferred her husband, her child and her home to the thrills of the new romance and returned to Detroit, to learn on her arrival that the companion of her wild adolescent adventure had shot himself to death. The whole unhappy incident seems to me to have grown out of an entirely false and disastrous philosophy, like indeed so many of the cheap vulgarities that have been coming to light in our divorce courts for many years back. It is perfectly innocent in a child to desire the immediacies of life and to be irked by the roundabout unexciting activities by which the great values are gained, but it is not innocent in grown-up people to demand continuously such immediacies. Such a demand inevitably leads to the very type of life we are witnessing today, reckless seeking of thrills, plunging into all sorts of temporary relations, legal and illegal, whipping up the jaded appetites by all sorts of novel and artificial stimuli and then justifying it all on the grounds of temperament and self-expression. The ethics of Aristippus will never work. Vivid feeling is no guide to right conduct. There must be some sense of the whole, some principle of order, some more or less permanent criterion of values or the whole race will degenerate into a sensual, selfish, quarrelsome mob of moral morons and civilization fail for lack of inner self-discipline.

The second Greek philosopher, Epicurus, who made pleasure the goal of life, was a much wiser man than Aristippus. He knew that the thrill of the moment was no guide to permanent value, and that indulgence in coarse bodily pleasures sooner or later brought a serious reckoning. Hence while he still believed that pleasure was the true goal, he tempered his zeal for it by a spirit of caution and timidity. Indeed he became so reasonable and prudent in seeking pleasure, he savored pleasure so intelligently with a view to eliminating its risks, he was so aware of the precariousness of the violent

pleasures, he shifted the emphasis so much from pleasure-seeking to self-control and tranquillity of mind that epicureanism almost joined hands with stoicism, the rival school of moral philosophy. The highest pleasures for Epicurus are no longer the immediacies of food and drink and sex and passive excitement but the pleasures that only come by roundabout ways and after much preparation, the pleasures of the intellect and art and social intercourse, in a word, the quiet pleasures of the simple life. Indeed the highest pleasure for Epicurus had no direct reference to the bodily life at all, but was rather a settled condition of the mind, peace, serenity, cheerfulness, absence of bodily suffering and mental worry.

You can see at once that Epicurus was far more of a philosopher than Aristippus. To estimate and measure the value of pleasure was a great art and his philosophy undertook to supply that art. He founded his school just in order to teach that art of ataraxia or poise of soul or emotionlessness or tranquillity. There were, he said, certain negative conditions that must be secured before the desired pleasure of tranquillity can result. You must, for example, free yourself from all the illusions that tend to weigh life down and to embitter joy. Natural science is the liberator of man from the delusions and oppressions of religion and superstition; therefore, you must study natural science just as far as is necessary to set you free. Natural science, for example, shows you that there is no interference in human affairs by supernatural powers. There are Gods, living at ease in the celestial world, but they do not trouble themselves about us or our affairs. Everything that takes place in the world takes place naturallly. Hence your first business is to banish superstition. Free yourself also from the idea of immortality. Life is long enough to taste every worthwhile good. Do not be too greedy of life but pass the torch on to the next generation. Do not let the bugbear of the hereafter disturb the calm serenity of your mind. Death cannot harm you, for so long as you live death hasn't come and when it comes you no longer exist. Live wholly for the present and seek your happiness in the present surroundings. Also avoid all the entanglements

of a responsible share in the world's work. Form no human ties such as marriage that may complicate and confuse your life. Regard civil life and its temptations to ambition and corruption with cold indifference. Enter only such free relationships as friendship, intellectual intercourse and philanthropy, for you can drop these when they become irksome. Choose if you can an absolute form of government to live under, for it maintains order better than a democracy.

You see, then, the kind of philosophy of life that epicureanism at its best provides. Conceive the end of life as pleasure and refine your concept of pleasure until it becomes tranquillity or poise of soul and you are yet obliged to give up some of the best things of life in order to attain it. It is improbable that many people today deny themselves all the activities which Epicurus said lead to distraction of mind but the popularity of such epicurean books as Fitzgerald's Omar Khayyam and the indifference of multitudes of educated people to religion, politics, reform and morals would seem to show that epicureanism in its more subtle forms has eaten deeply into their souls.

Now, in the light of the attitude to life of the great Nazarene prophet whose career is so often in our minds on such an occasion as this, what criticism shall we make of this popular epicurean creed?

First of all, epicureanism is a sheer parasite, living on what others have produced. It is a coward's creed, an ideal of life which is embraced by those who have not the courage to meet resistance or combat trouble, by those to whom duty has never appealed as something dignified and majestic, as Wordsworth says, "a stern daughter of the voice of God." The epicurean habit of mind has never created a civilization but has always flourished in a civilization already more or less mature or even over-mature. The principle of pleasure, as the end of life, even when refined to the utmost, can never produce heroes. Pleasure has a legitimate secondary place in the whole of life and that fact must not be overlooked in our account of morals or in our moral training of the young, but, as an ultimate goal, it is a flat failure. You cannot evoke

what is highest and best in human nature, either in others or in yourselves, by dangling pleasure before the mind's eye. The sight of the suffering of Jesus on the cross has stirred the souls of men more than the contemplation of all the tranquillity of all the refined epicureans of all the ages.

Moreover, it is intellectually unproductive. It uses science only negatively to dispel the superstitions that hinder man's happiness but cannot inspire the labors and the sacrifices that are necessary to push the frontiers of knowledge further and further into the unknown. Indeed it is probable that there has been far more epicureanism among our literary and artistic classes than among our scientific workers. Hutley's scornful phrase about "the caterwauling of the literary classes" may have been inspired by the feeling that science is free from the exhibitionism and narcissism of temperamental people who easily adopt a narrow personalistic and epicurean attitude to life. However that may be, it is easily seen that a curiosity more powerful heroic and unselfish than a pleasure-lover can ever evoke from his mind is necessary if science is to achieve the mighty ends that are so ardently hoped for in the field of physics, chemistry, medicine, sociology and psychology.

Lastly, epicureanism is spiritually barren. Both the epicurean and the mystic retreat into themselves from the world but for an entirely different purpose. The mystic seeks solitude in order that he may bring his soul into contact with some source of spiritual vitality deeper than his own conscious mind and after allowing for the elements of fantasy, other-wordliness and self-deception that are often present in mysticism, it must be acknowledged that out of the mystic's solitary communion with God or his own deeper soul there have come a warmth, a richness, a profound spiritual assurance that have added very materially to the moral assets of the whole world. But out of the ataraxia, the poise, the emotionlessness of the epicurean's retreat and communion with himself there has come nothing but spiritual poverty and barrenness, enjoyment but no significant creativity. Even

the most refined pleasure is only a secondary thing, an accompaniment of something greater than itself. Mere feeling has no principle of organization within it and, therefore, when mere feeling, mere immediacy, the thrill or the equilibrium of the present moment, is made the end of life, the upshot is inevitably chaos or conflict or spiritual stagnation.

Our Western civilization has been suffering for many years back from this philosophy. We have mastered the sea, the land and the air for practical economic purposes as no former generation ever did, but instead of using our mastery for sound social purposes, such as raising and stabilizing the standard of living, lifting the manual workers to a higher cultural level, encouraging a high type of art, music and literature, spiritualizing morals and religion, eliminating disease and the probability of war, we have been demoralized by our wealth and made it a means to sensuous, hedonistic and individualistic pleasures. We have plunged into the most reckless speculation and spending that this old world has ever witnessed and we are now paying the price of it in an economic depression which has broken, for the moment at least, both our fortunes and our spirits. Let us, then, who are the heirs of a great moral tradition, who do not take our morals and our religion on mere hearsay, as so many do, use this time of defeat and frustration to educate ourselves for a wise use of prosperity, if and when it does return. Let us teach the people over and over again that pleasure as the end of life can never be an adequate principle of organization and control, that though it has a rightful place in a sane philosophy of life, that place must be secondary and subsidiary, and that the old paradox of hedonism is still true, namely, that the way to ensure pleasure is to forget all about it and throw ourselves into some significant cause. Let us remind ourselves that the way to avoid depressions and the moral suffering and collapse that come with them is to use our prosperous years more wisely, thoughtfully and unselfishly with a view to thinking out and bringing into effect a saner, juster, humaner social order. The reckless pursuit of individual

pleasure has landed us where we now are; only a sounder philosophy of life which gives pleasure its proper place in the whole scheme of existence can keep us from repeating our costly blunder.

Naturalism

George Croswell Cressey

Words in English are largely spelled and pronounced as custom dictates. That has long been understood. There is an apparent tendency also unfortunately to give words sometimes a significance which neither their literal meaning nor experience justifies. A free-thinker is defined and popularly understood as one who does not accept current religious ideas. That such think more or are freer in their thought is by no means evident. They are often as dogmatic in their views of the world and man as the so-called ecclesiastic. Their thought is no freer or more in accord with what seems to them reason than the conclusions of those who accept in some form the beliefs of natural religion. So-called orthodox science has laid down certain principles as governing all phenomena and tends to reject facts of alleged experience without investigation because they seem contrary to these principles. There is no difference between this so-called scientific attitude and that of the ecclesiastic. A similar fate seems to have befallen the word naturalism. Natural and naturalism in their legitimate meaning have no reference to the essence of facts or reality; they refer to the source or the process. The natural takes place according to law in a world or universe of order. The essential nature of the phenomena is not properly indicated or limited by the term. Mental and spiritual phenomena may be indeed assumed to be as natural as the material. The supernatural on the other hand is something caused by the interference of an external intelligence or power in the order of events. To confine the natural to the material is to beg the question of the nature of things; it assumes that matter is the sole reality, calls everything material natural and aught else which may be supposed to exist, supernatural. Naturalism is thus a less sinister name for materialism, and in fact a polite synonym of atheism. It does not eject Deity from the

universe but courteously informs him that his presence is no longer necessary.

Materialism involves the belief that there is no fundamental distinction between mental and material phenomena, that all is essentially material. One has a right to this belief, but it devolves upon him to show, to some extent at least, what is the casual connection, what is the common unit or measure, since if one form is supposed to pass into another of an entirely different kind it is necessary to show some common measure, some definite process through which the one is transmuted into the other. Has such unit or process been discovered or even imagined? The words of Tyndall are still true, "The passage from matter to mind is unthinkable." Materialism is still merely an assertion.

Mr. J. W. N. Sullivan, an able English writer on modern science, ends his discussion by affirming that it—recent science — has entirely discarded Victorian materialism. It is claimed, however, that materialism may be re-constructed on the basis of modern physics. A writer in "The Thinker" labors to this end. Certainly the theory is not overthrown by the substitution of the electron for the atom or by symbols in the place of something apparently more concrete. But have the electron and the symbols removed the difficulties? Have they shown any possibility of tracing the process by which matter, whatever be its unit, passes into mind, a reality, or, if one prefer, a phenomenon, entirely disparate in character? Is a blind force, whatever it be called, suggestive of intelligence? But it is said the force is not necessarily blind, it is of an indefinite, unknown character and in due time *integrates* into consciousness. This is one of those not uncommon cases in science and philosophy where an explanation is sought by use of a somewhat ponderous phrase. The problem remains the same. If the unknown power be mental, materialism vanishes; if it be material, then it is precisely the same unthinkable problem of the corpuscular atom, the problem of Victorian materialism. It may be said, of course, that both material and mental are products of a higher inscrutable reality which no theist would deny. Here there is less reason

than ever to regard the mental as a product of the material; in fact its possibility is practically denied.

Phenomena of any kind may be held to be natural, and there is no reason why the development of phenomena from a higher source should not be natural also, according to law.

Many believe that the amœba has a low, primitive degree of consciousness, but this lowest form of life is without organization. If consciousness precede organization, all forms of materialistic theory collapse and naturalism must be used, if at all, in its proper sense.

The use of the word as the equivalent of materialism is practically a device in the interest of propaganda. In reading some article or book of this character one notes that the author rejects the supernatural. This accords with his thought and he becomes at once sympathetic; but, not well versed in the general subject, he may not sense the circumscribed view of the natural or the forced idea of the supernatural so far from the traditional and accepted meaning of the word. Unless on his guard he will be misled.

Sir James Jeans says, "The universe begins to look more like a great thought than a great machine. Mind no longer appears as an accidental intruder into the realm of matter; we are beginning to suspect that we ought rather to hail it as the creator and governor of the realm of matter."

Prof. Hornell Hart at the Unitarian National Conference in October, 1931, said: "The true age of science is only beginning to emerge out of an age of mechanistic materialism. Materialists jumped too hastily to the conclusion that death terminates the individual personality. The weight of informed scientific opinion now leans strongly toward belief in the reality of survival." These statements are not unsatisfactory, but we should not be rapid in our conclusions. The new cosmogony and its corollaries are not yet thoroughly tested. So far as it is true, however, may we not insist that it is natural, that if mind represents the nature of the Infinite we are not in the sphere of the supernatural, rather we are in that higher realm which we call spiritual in contrast with the material and mechanical. A realm in which all things are governed by the laws of spirit, is equally natural.

(FORM OF BEQUEST)

I give and bequeath unto The Meadville Theological School, located at Woodlawn Avenue and Fifty-Seventh Street, in the City of Chicago, Illinois, the sum of ———— Dollars.